The
COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XLV November 22, 1946 NUMBER 6

THE WEEK 131
FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE
Valentin le Désossé 132
DIVIDED KOREA *Page Gilman* 134
VERDICT ON NUREMBERG
Christopher Emmet 138
COMMUNICATIONS 141
The Labor Movement—Religion and Civilization—The Estrada Incident
THE STAGE *Kappo Phelan* 144
THE SCREEN *Philip T. Hartung* 145
THE LABOR MOVEMENT *John C. Cort* 146
BOOKS OF THE WEEK 148
Priestess of the Occult: Madame Blavatsky—Lord Hornblower—Vinland the Good—Journal from My Cell—Five Million Patients: The Professional Life of a Health Officer

THE COMMONWEAL *is indexed in the Reader's Guide, Catholic periodical Index and Catholic Bookman. Founded by the Calvert Associates, Inc., in 1924, with Michael Williams as President and Editor.*

Published weekly and copyrighted 1946 in the U. S. A. by The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. ASbland 4-9683. Entered as second class matter February 9, 1934, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. U.S. and Canada $6 a year, Foreign $7. Single copies 15c.

Editors: EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.
PHILIP BURNHAM

HARRY LORIN BINSSE, *Managing Editor;* C. G. PAULDING, *Literary Editor;* JOHN C. CORT, *Associate Editor;* JOHN BRUBAKER, *Advertising Manager.*

Justice

IT WILL be remembered that some months ago great public sympathy was enlisted on behalf of Isaac Woodard, Jr., a New York Negro war veteran who was blinded as the result of his treatment at the hands of the police chief of Batesburg, South Carolina. Criminal charges were brought against this police chief—who admitted he was responsible—and the case recently came to trial. On November 5, an all-white, all-male jury acquitted Chief Shull of the charge of violating the right of a citizen "to be secure in his person," a charge brought by the Department of Justice of the Federal Government. It will interest lawyers to learn that the District Attorney handling the case, Mr. Claude Sapp, in his final speech to the jury, did not ask for a verdict of guilty and in substance stated that whatever verdict the jury brought in would be agreeable to to the Government—a procedure to say the least unusual on the part of a prosecuting officer. In this same connection it is interesting to observe that the FBI, which has done such brilliant work with apprehending enemy agents during the war and with tracking down even minor criminals, has never succeeded in producing anything in cases where minority rights are concerned—cases involving lynching or mistreatment. A few peonage cases have indeed been successfully handled, but by their very nature such cases do not require much sleuthing. All in all, the evidence makes one wonder just what sort of Department of Justice is at present functioning in Washington.

Agriculture

ON SEVERAL occasions THE COMMONWEAL has criticized Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson. We now are confronted with the extraordinary situation of the Farm Bureau Federation joining with the Farmers Union in opposition to Mr. Anderson's activities. The specific occasion for this extraordinary case of strange bedfellows was the proposed reorganization of the Production and Marketing Administration.

Apparently, what Mr. Anderson sought was to reorganize this agency in the interests of food processors and distributors as opposed to those of the farmers. And in addition, the Farmers Union is convinced that the whole tendency of the Department of Agriculture is toward a return to the economy of scarcity, a disastrous tendency in a world desperately needing food. The Farmers Union states its case very cogently in relation to the new potato program of the Department:

> In the program, the Department of Agriculture has returned to scarcity economics. In other words, acreage reduction to avoid a "surplus" is being imposed. Throughout World War II we were told we were fighting for a world of abundance and freedom. You cannot have a world of abundance in which business and agriculture deliberately restrict production in order either to cut governmental costs or to keep prices artificially high.
>
> Furthermore, a return to such a system in the long run will hurt more farmers than it will help. Every farmer will be dependent for his livelihood upon a government acreage quota. These acreage quotas, as was flagrantly illustrated in the case of cotton, can be used to keep new family farmers out of production and will be capitalized as part of the inflated costs of farms for new farmers. Consumers may be deprived of an ample supply. If such a policy prevails in our farm programs, then we will be back in the same old vicious circle of under-production and under-consumption.

And thus more and more evidence accumulates to show that in this department of the Federal Government a changed world has not even stimulated the superficial and rudimentary changes in point of view which one might expect, even of a man in the street.

We submit that both this paragraph and that preceding it serve as partial commentary on the recent election results.

Achieving More Production

IN THE days when there seemed to be real danger of wartime or postwar runaway inflation one of the slogans of the opponents of rigid price controls was that increased production would take care of everything. Now the urge for upping

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

production is spurred on by higher wages. The hope is that a way may be found to forestall an all-out Australian pursuit race between wages and prices by having each better paid worker actually produce more. The current AFL monthly survey, basing its wage cost figures on Cleveland Trust Company statistics, actually finds that from March to July of this year that "although the rise in workers' average hourly earnings was exceptionally rapid in this period, production per man hour rose more than enough to pay for the wage gains." A bit more testimony and documentation to this effect would certainly be heartening.

No such happy picture emerged from the recent conference of labor, business and government representatives in Washington sponsored by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Labor representatives laid much stress on the "distortions" in the Bureau's figures. The paid vacations included because production figures were based on man-hours paid, they held, tended to depress unfairly the averaged workers' production figures. Likewise, workers were too often blamed for low production when the cause was inefficient management or shortages of materials. The fact that labor's representatives were so patently on the defensive here makes one wonder at the AFL's recorded satisfaction.

While it is heinous to regard workers or labor cost simply as an item in a balance sheet, good productivity per man is all-important for business, especially in days of rising costs. The inhuman speed-up provides, of course, no acceptable solution. What is widely recognized is that teamwork is the secret of healthy high productivity.

The basic study is that which has been published over the years for Western Electric. The Army, too, has found out a lot about it in the past five years. Furthermore the spectacular war production exploits of Henry J. Kaiser and Jack & Heintz and others have piled up much additional useful data.

Americans ought to be pretty good at hitting upon the ingredients of real teamwork. The elimination of psychological misfits and the assignment of natural leaders of men to key posts have been found to be more important from the strict viewpoint of production even than rates of pay, working conditions and other basic factors. And once a certain harmony is achieved by the application of these two important measures, then the introduction of frequent recreation periods, an appropriate musical background, if not the wafting of gentle perfumes, may be able to step up production still higher without harmful worker effects. And it must clearly be said that no efficient teamwork is possible without genuine worker-management confidence.

Since plenty of data is available some of the pressure in the price-wage rat-race could be relieved by labor-management consultations—plant by plant, or industry by industry—on the means of producing more all round. Without a spirit of mutual collaboration no such attempt is possible.

Publishers'-Authors' Counter-Attacks

FROM the midst of 2,000 books published in America this year, which the National Arts Club morbidly gathered together for its forty-first annual book show, Mr. Harrison Smith, a New York publisher, delivered a lively counter-attack against those authors of the nation who have recently been so fervently sympathizing with their own economic lot and arguing about making a hard boiled "Authors Authority" for the sake of their personal prosperity or for some unadmitted occult reasons. The *Times* reported Mr. Smith stating that "publishers' prizes, movie rights and lucrative magazine arrangements had replaced the drive to produce genuine work."

Writers, we take this and the rest to mean, are less than before attempting to speak as truly as they can and write the best they can. They are not so concerned to create art or to prophesy now as when their ancestors gained reputation. Book and magazine publishers and the movies have diverted their talents for money. These commercial forces have offered enough cash reward for a written product to turn writers from trying to create their best work to trying to manufacture a product which publishers and they themselves consider to be inferior.

The motives we do not know. We do consider it a fact, however, that those 2,000 volumes tend to be, all in all, unnecessarily low grade, uninteresting products, masses of which were better not produced and circulated. The publishers deserve no defense for getting them written and selling them, and the donors of the prizes might be the last expected to complain. It is not easy, on the other hand, to glorify the literary artists who write them, and to feel an ardent sympathy for their complaints about low wages. They have got themselves into a stupid spiral indeed, if they turn out bad stuff in order to collect "prizes," "rights," and "arrangements," and then have to howl that the collections are cruelly inadequate.

Foreign Correspondence

DEAR EDITOR: I don't know how to tell you this story but I know you don't expect much from me because I have been in America too long whereas there are these planes which bring our best correspondents across the Atlantic so fast that they can write all about America as soon as they land in New York because it is as if they had not really left Paris at all. When they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get here they know exactly what they have been thinking and writing in the home office, maybe they bring their pieces already written; it looks that way because the dateline is all there is to show that they are traveling about the world admiring it.

That's all right; I'm not annoyed; your better employees have explained the recent elections, a matter I would find difficult to handle since I am almost as confused as an American about their significance; they have taken their stand against American culture, but there are so many books printed in this country that I have stopped reading altogether, so that my piece on American materialism would lack the fresh documentation that my colleagues obtain at their first cocktail party if not from the customs officials at La Guardia Field.

I read only the newspapers, specifically the tabloids with the photographs of the crashes, the corpses and femmes; I read them at night in the subway coming home from some materialist American concert; that is how I know about this affair in Hackensack, N. J.

In spite of strikes and those things, there are so many automobiles on American roads that you get confused when you watch them go by and so it is not surprising that this young woman, engaged in the American practice of hitch-hiking, "thumbed" (as you have seen them do in the movies) a ride before she knew what kind of car it was and found too late that it was a police car. The officers (gendarmes) of Hackensack, N. J., said sure get in and who are you and where can we take you, lady? They are kind people in Hackensack and they know that anyone who does not live and work there probably, with some desperation, wants to go almost anywhere else. And so this girl said I have been picking potatoes in Maine and I am going to Florida; I am Susan Bower. On foot, they asked? Well, she said, what is that to you. And so they got to talking; the policemen thought that Florida was a long way off for a nice girl to be walking to and when Susan said that she came from Bozeman, Montana, which is way across this continent, as if in Paris she had told you she was Ukrainian or something, they decided that they should protect her and keep her from getting herself lost or abducted or bumped off by some tramp if really her business consisted in such wide travel. And, alternately, if her business consisted in being (see the films again) a gun moll.

So they took her to a judge who said now tell me really, I'm a friend, who you are or tell the police matron if you don't like telling a man. But Susan said if you want to know who I am go ahead and find out so the judge said you are a vagrant and I want to know who you are, there is something in Denmark, and you are unable to give what the law says you should furnish which is to say a "good account of yourself," and so you can go to jail for six months and Susan said I can go to jail forever but I'm not going to talk.

So the subway newspapers called her Silent Susan and they printed her picture all over the country but no policeman anywhere said *tiens, tiens,* this is the little bird I have been looking for.

In America there are committees for everything and there is one for the preservation of Civil Liberties. This committee coming home one night in the subway from some materialistic conference on the rights of man looked at Susan's picture, read the little story I have told you and said sometimes it is a little difficult about the Negroes in the South but here is a girl, just across the river, out West in New Jersey, and although she is not being tortured or anything it looks to us as if she were being held in "protective custody" and so they sent a lawyer to see the judge to explain that an American cannot be held in jail just because something *might* be wrong and, what do you know; the judge said that was true indeed and so he re-sentenced Susan to the time she already had spent in jail and then Susan walked out of jail and went away.

She is still "Susan Bower"; the connection between asking policemen to give you a ride in their automobile and having to tell them who you are has not been established—thanks to her stubbornness. Unidentified Susan has walked freely away to her destiny—if not too unfortunate a one, we may never hear of her again.

This little story I must report as being extremely significant since it indicates that personal liberty is still an American habit. This liberty of the citizen, doubtless, is violated by the police from time to time but only when no one is looking—surreptitiously, and when Americans hear about such incidents they do not like them. They dislike them so greatly that it does not seem probable to me that they will ever allow them to become systematized, or codified.

I fear this correspondent's report may prove embarrassing to you; probably you will not desire to use it. Yet it might please some of our older readers, who feel nostalgia for the past. Susan sounds like someone who lived in our Europe before we had to carry identity cards and before we had to explain to the police that it was because our old aunt was ill that we wanted to travel as far as from one village to another. Susan sounds as if she had never heard about "displaced persons." Publishing her story might give some of our oldest readers the innocent and possibly futile pleasure of remembering the past.

Please accept, dear editor, the expression of my highest esteem.

VALENTIN LE DÉSOSSÉ
(English by C. G. Paulding).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Divided Korea

A nation stumbles toward independence

Page Gilman

THE FIRST year of our Military Government in Korea has just come to an end, but the poor confused people of that land have not seen even a nominal progression toward their goal of complete independence. Having escaped from half a century of Japanese imperialism, now they are trapped in the crossfire of American and Soviet political maneuvering.

Confusion and a desperate intensity of political feeling were the heritage which the departing Japanese left to them; after forty years of occupation and oppression, the Koreans were not in the least prepared for freedom or even able to understand its meaning, but then, liberation was not at all what they had expected it to be. For years they had supported the Provisional Government in exile, and confidently expected its leaders would accompany the Allied forces, but Kim Koo and Rhee Syng Man failed to return for nearly two months, then came as private citizens. The greatest disappointment was the arbitrary partition of their land into a Soviet zone north of the 38th parallel, and an American zone south of that line. Once largely self-sufficient, Korea found herself broken into two parts without internal communications, exchange of products, or even the nominal identity she had had under the Japanese.

The American commander, Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, was a soldier with orders to relieve and disarm the Jap troops within his zone, to establish contact with the Soviets, and to set up a Military Government for his area. He went immediately to work on these tasks, and then did his best to explain the situation to the hundreds who called on him in bewilderment, asking, "Where is our Provisional Government?"

The answer was that America has ever followed the policy of not recognizing governments-in-exile until the people have had an opportunity to express themselves in a free election. Furthermore, since the Koreans had been so long without self-government, surely they needed a certain amount of assistance.

"Okay," said the persistent petition-presenters, "how about this 38-degree business? Why is our land divided?"

How could General Hodge or Mr. Benninghoff, his State Department representative, answer such a question? The division was probably conceived for a shooting invasion of Korea, but peace had come too suddenly for a revision of the plan. Nobody could say for sure.

After their long shotgun wedding with the Japanese, the Koreans have adopted a fatalistic attitude toward international decisions. There was Teddy Roosevelt's 1905 Treaty of Portsmouth that bestowed their land on Japan, and President Wilson's "Self-Determination for Small Nations." This was the inspiration for a Korean Declaration of Independence in 1919, yet the League of Nations did nothing about the imprisonment and beheading of the Declaration's signers.

There was no glimmer of hope until 1943's Cairo Declaration by President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Generalissimo Chiang, pledging the United Nations to the principle that "Korea shall in due course become free and independent." But this gave rise to a third question to plague General Hodge: "Why aren't we free and independent?"

"Be patient," said the Military Government posters, "'In due course' doesn't mean right away!"

However, the tribulations of the United States Army Military Government in Korea were by no means confined to answering questions. Lacking proper leadership and completely unfamiliar with democracy, the people had a surprising conception of its blessings. Remembering Franklin Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, the Koreans added a fifth: Freedom from Work!

Three weeks elapsed between the day of the Emperor's announcement of surrender and the arrival of American troops, and in that period the people indulged in a tremendous spree of irresponsibility; for the first time they dared talk back to the hated police, to act as they pleased without fear of torture or imprisonment; now it was the policemen who were afraid. The Japs did everything they could to preserve peace and friendship: political prisoners were released from jail (some wardens released every prisoner, including thieves and murderers), while in place of town and municipal governments, the natives formed hundreds of "Committees" (in some cases, little more than armed mobs). Then, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a vain effort to keep just a little good-will, Japanese merchants and manufacturers paid their employees huge bonuses when they quit their jobs, and the Fifth Freedom was born! Why, said the Koreans, should a man work when his pockets are filled with money?

Handicapped by the language barrier, and even more by the gulf between Orient and Occident, the Americans were unable to explain that this indulgence in Freedom from Work was actually injuring Korea. Since for 40 years they had had Japanese employers, the Koreans could think of no more appropriate benefit of liberation than the right to quit working. What did it matter that the national economy came to a standstill—Freedom was to be enjoyed! Freedom of Speech came to mean the right to misquote official statements, to put any words in any mouth. Freedom from Fear meant the right to rob Jap civilians of their possessions and to conduct armed searches for Korean "traitors." Freedom of Religion meant not only release from compulsory Shinto worship, but the right to tear down the shrines so the Japs couldn't use them either!

To the men of the XXIV Corps, the 7th, 6th and 40th Divisions, only recently in desperate combat, it was something of a disappointment to find that the costly efforts which had given these little people their freedom were so peculiarly appreciated.

★

Not that the soldiers weren't welcomed profusely, vociferously. On September 8th, as the first units entered the towns of Kyonggi Province, everywhere they saw signs crying "U.S.A. Army Welcome Hurrah." Then on October 20th the people staged an immense Victory Celebration and Parade of Welcome which stopped all trade and traffic in Seoul, the capital, for a whole day.

For the event five immense Allied flags were hung along the face of the capitol building. Fifty American officers sat with the Korean Committee on a platform below, behind them ten burly MPs. Three infantrymen stood dramatically on the marquee above; throughout the grounds there was a fully armed soldier almost every ten feet, and in strategic corners machine guns had been placed. The mass of the people had come to welcome the Americans, but the radical political groups had placed our high-ranking officers on a list for assassination. (No attempts were ever made, but this was not for lack of precaution).

The mushroom growth of Korean politics stemmed from the same three weeks' chaos which had given rise to the Fifth Freedom. Not only were most Koreans disinterested in going back to work, but they had found a new and fascinating occupation: politics! About a month after the initial landings, the government ordered all political parties to register, and over 50 presented their claims for recognition. By November 2nd, the number had grown to 205! At times it seemed as if anybody with ten friends immediately formed a new party! Among them were the Supporters' Union for All-Korean Political Actors, the Nameless Society, the Forlorn Hope Society, and the Preparatory Committee for Return of the Provisional Korean Republic Government!

This prolixity was only the surface of what was basically the matter with Korean politics: immaturity. While the Soviet political machine was smoothly at work in Northern Korea, the occupants of the American zone were continually bickering, arguing and passing meaningless resolutions. The great national heroes had returned, but no effort was made to unite southern Korea around them. Then it became a standard practice for citizens to accuse each other of having been "pro-Jap"; a little later the definition of a pro-Jap became clear: anyone who had more money than you did.

Perhaps the most surprising event of the early months of occupation was the discovery that even the Korean Boy Scouts were a political organization. Carefully directed, the little fellows first won American sympathy, then wormed their way into former Jap warehouses for uniform material. But about a month later reports began to come in of rice trucks hi-jacked by "Boy Scouts." In outlying towns opposing political leaders were attacked by big strapping fellows in the uniform which is famous as a symbol of the Good Deed. Careful investigation revealed that the "Scouts" had a heavy membership aged 21-27, that their political activities were violently leftist, and not at all of the kind prescribed by Lord Baden-Powell. The Boy Scouts were disbanded.

The national preoccupation with politics is a unique and sometimes amazing phenomenon. Babies carried pick-a-back are still not too small to carry flags in political demonstrations; once a group of women and girls stood in snow for over eight hours in order to yell "Mansei!" (Long live Korea) at every passing Army vehicle.

The zenith of political fervor was reached on the last day of 1945, with the great demonstration in protest against the Moscow Communiqué. Repercussions are still being felt in Seoul, Moscow and Washington from that exciting day.

In December Messrs. Byrnes, Bevin and Molotov had met in Moscow and drew up several agreements which are collectively known as the Moscow Communiqué. Section III, Korea, framed a rough but workable solution for the dissolution of the 38-degree line. Unfortunately the initial, fragmentary, news release contained the phrase, "a four-power trusteeship of Korea." In Seoul, only the dropping of an atomic bomb

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could have created more excitement. Japan, in 1905, had taken over the land under what she called a "trusteeship." Here was the awful word again; Korea had been betrayed!

On the 27th, things began to pop. All troops were ordered off the streets, while the Koreans closed their restaurants, kiisang houses and shops. The city began to seethe with excitement, and General Hodge wired Washington: "Korean reaction . . . immediate and hysterical."

Next day the official communiqué arrived by radio and General Hodge called a press conference to explain it in full. He pointed out that a U.S.-Soviet Commission would form a Provisional Government, and pounded home the fact that the Korean political parties would be consulted, would have a voice in the formation of their own government. Over and over he explained that the proposed trusteeship was limited to five years, but the newsmen refused stubbornly to understand any meaning of "trusteeship" except that which the Japanese had given it, and they saw no reason for resuming cooperation with the Military Government.

★

There seemed to be no way in which the leaders could be made to understand that their actions were hurting Korea's cause—that their childish agitation was only insuring a long trusteeship. For nearly two hours General Hodge and General Arnold, the Military Governor, were closeted with Kim Kyu Sik, Kim Koo's principal lieutenant and advisor, yet even that American-educated Doctor of Philosophy could not be made to understand. It seemed fantastic that such a nation-wide furor could be raised over the definition of a single word.

Only a few accepted our assurances of good faith, among them bulldog-faced old Song Jin Woo, a member of the Governor's Advisory Council. For his acceptance of the proposed "trusteeship," Song was assassinated on December 28th. His death was the only tragic note in the entire farce, and by striking fear into the hearts of the few other supporters of American policy, dispelled the few hopes remaining.

Sunday was a day of little excitement—perhaps because holidays mean more to the Korean than politics, if possible. On Monday, however, Kim Koo announced that he was taking over the government. Just like that. No question about it as far as many Koreans were concerned; why there had to be all this guff about a Military Government and a U.S.-Soviet Commission they had never been able to fathom.

His official demonstration that afternoon was orderly throughout, though not as colorful as the earlier parade of welcome. Each person seemed to have a small Korean flag, and some sort of banner was carried at the head of every hundred or so marchers. Dr. Horace Underwood, who has spent his lifetime in Korea, read all the banners, listened to all the cries. There was no abuse of Americans, he reported, though there was a good deal of cussing at any Koreans not already marching. The parade (it had 30,000 marchers) lasted an hour and a half, and at its conclusion it was agreed that Kim Koo had amply demonstrated his party's dislike of trusteeship, but if he had hoped to force an acceptance of his Government by the Allied powers, he had failed.

That night, New Year's Eve, Dr. Syngman Rhee joined the fight and went on the air with a plea to "stop this foolishness," though the foolishness continued. The excitement came to an end with the bravery of Lee Hoon Koo and Cho Pyeng Ok, bureau-heads of the Military Government, and a statement by Mr. Byrnes.

The bravery for which Drs. Lee and Cho will long be remembered by those who knew the story, consisted of going to Kim Koo, penetrating the inner circle of his bodyguards, in order to convince him of American sincerity. This was no idle act, for the old battler has a regular gangster's retinue, and has himself killed several Japanese officers. He was not completely convinced, but the lengthy telegram of the Secretary of State admitting that "The Joint U.S.-Soviet Commission may find it possible to dispense with a trusteeship," was sufficiently face-saving to allow him to withdraw his opposition.

The crisis had passed. The Military Government employees went back to work, and though there were several minor demonstrations for the following fortnight, none approached the size or spirit of Kim Koo's.

★

On the 16th of January a U.S.-Soviet conference convened "for the consideration of urgent problems establishing permanent coordination in administrative-economic matters." The Soviet members had not come to discuss politics. In fact, after three weeks of argument, it appeared that they were not interested in discussing much at all. The best that could be done for the economic or administrative unity of Korea was an arrangement for the interchange of mail between the two zones, chlorine for water-purification in Seoul, and for school-children to cross the border if necessary!

These first conferences showed Maj. Gen. A. V. Arnold, chief of delegation, and the other members that dealing with the Soviets was no easy task, that the forthcoming Joint Commission would probably be no less than a battleground on which the future of Korea would hang in the balance. The differences in political viewpoint and even in methods of working were so vast that a practical and smooth solution seemed as distant as it had four months before.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prior to the assembling of the Joint Commission, a semblance of political unity was imposed in the American zone; most of the party leaders joined the Representative Democratic Political Council. Dr. Rhee, whose name is known to the meanest peasant in the land, became president. The council was to be the American instrument for bargaining, just as the Soviets would have their political group headed by the legendary Kim Il Sung. Magnificent quarters were prepared in old Tuck-Soo Palace, but the grand opening was postponed several times at Soviet request.

It was apparent that the strained international situation was responsible for the many delays: in March the UNO was faced with the Iranian question. Even though the machinery for solution was all set up, the Korean problem seemed shelved, her independence again postponed.

When the Iranian question had been cleared up, Col. Gen. Shtikov arrived in Seoul with his group. The American delegation was again headed by General Arnold. The dream of independence was revived, then quickly shattered as General Shtikov stated the Russian position in his opening speech. "We do not intend," he said, "to deal with any parties or individuals who have opposed the decisions of the three Foreign Ministers in Moscow!"

Every political party in southern Korea had openly protested the proposed trusteeship of the Moscow Comuniqué, though the communist People's Republic (perhaps on orders) had reversed its initial and spontaneous expression and had publicly espoused trusteeship. Thus the Soviet stand was plain—a communist state in Korea or none!

Weeks were consumed over the questions of an agenda (favorite Soviet haggling point) and the issuance of press communiqués (to which they are categorically opposed), but in April the delegates were able to tackle the difficult question of eligibility. After lengthy debate and bargaining, a compromise was worked out and signed by the Chief Commissioners. This agreement did not require previous support of trusteeship, but merely stipulated that organizations to be consulted in the formation of the new government should cooperate with the Commission on anything it should work out. Implication: even trusteeship.

Still Moscow was not satisfied: a day or so later, General Shtikov announced that not one member of the Representative Council was eligible for consultation because that body had announced that it would cooperate until a government had been formed, then would consider itself free to criticize. This made the issue quite clear: the two national heroes were members of the Representative Council, and though the Korean people had idolized them for a quarter of a century, they were unacceptable to the Soviets.

There was no possibility of further compromise. Always wooden, the Soviet Commissioners now became downright stubborn. No progress could be made on the matter of eligibility so the American delegation — tongue in cheek — suggested that the Commission undertake to remove the 38-degree line.

"No!" was the thunderous answer, so the issues were referred to a higher level for solution. On May 6 the Soviet Delegation departed for Pyongyang, their headquarters, but no word has yet been received from northern Korea, nor have Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Molotov announced any solution of the deadlock; Korean independence is still a dream.

It is now apparent that the Kremlin's interest in Korea is keyed either to its program of Asiatic expansion or for use as an instrument of bargaining with the United States. Whenever the representatives of the Soviet Union have sat down to discuss Korea, their tactics have followed one simple, transparent plan: every possible parliamentary obstacle is placed in our path; every decision required endless delays and consultations with higher headquarters; at every turn they have made it plain that they consider the Koreans as political children, neither trustworthy to walk alone nor capable of receiving direction.

On the matter of reparations Soviet intentions are not so very clear. She has agreed to Korea's position as a friendly nation, so that any looting must be done under conditions of great secrecy. American headquarters in Seoul have had many eyewitness reports of the removal of capital goods—machinery, hydroelectric equipment, and even food, but have never been able to present these facts to the world because of this secrecy.

Still, no matter what other reasons motivate Soviet noncooperation in Korea, the biggest factor is the worldwide battle of ideologies. While the Western powers and Russia are at outs in Paris and in the chambers of the UNO, there will never be any hope for Korea. It might be only coincidental, but the Seoul Commission broke up on the same day that Mr. Molotov broke with Mr. Byrnes in their first Paris conference!

Now, a year after our triumphal entry into the oppressed land, the American Military Government is proceeding with plans for a Provisional Government of Southern Korea, having given up hope of any reconciliation between North and South within a foreseeable future. Political unification has proceeded apace, to the point where, although they are not reconciled, Left and Right are at least amicable. The Fifth Freedom has given way to what passes in the Orient for industriousness, so that for at least five-eighths of Korea's people there is a faint glimmer of hope in the future. In the meantime, independence must wait for a more favorable moment in American-Soviet diplomatic history.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Verdict on Nuremberg

Christopher Emmet

ALTHOUGH THE NUREMBERG trials are over, for a long time to come the court itself will have to face the judgment of public opinion before a final verdict on its own work can be rendered. Regardless of that verdict there will be no regrets for the executed men, but the pretensions of Nuremberg to have pioneered a new era in international law have not been established.

One doubt was expressed by Senator Taft: that these men were tried by a court of visitors only, with no legal standing, for crimes which were not recognized as crimes at the time they were committed. This has been ably answered by Justice Jackson. It is not my intention to deal with this debate here. Yet if all the judging nations had come to Nuremberg with reasonably clean hands, then the trials really might have been the milestone in history which Justice Jackson believes them to be. Unfortunately, however, against the assets of Nuremberg we must balance the growing suspicion that leaders of one of the judging nations should have been sitting with the nazi criminals in the prisoners' dock.

The doubt here which troubles many Americans runs as follows: "If, as some of the most respected Allied newspapermen in the world have charged, one of the judging nations at Nuremberg and its satellites were committing most of the same crimes of which the defendants were accused, *both before and during the trial itself*, does that not destroy the value of the verdict?" Father Edmund Walsh, S.J., answers this question as follows in the November 9th issue of *America*:

> But the presence of a dubious judge on a full bench does not nullify the integrity or the judgments of the majority, any more than the personal unworthiness of a minister of religion invalidates the sacraments he is called on to administer.

Thus the conviction of Judge Manton did not invalidate the decisions he had made after the crimes of which he was later convicted. Nevertheless even though the validity of the Nuremberg verdict still stands, surely its moral value, its hold on public opinion, and its power as a precedent are deeply prejudiced if the same crimes have indeed been committed by one of the judging nations.

The nazi war criminals were accused under three main counts: One, the conspiracy to wage aggressive war; Two, the violation of international law and all the conventions applying to the rules of warfare—in short, "war crimes"; and Three, crimes against humanity. These crimes are defined as follows in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal: "(a) crimes against peace, namely, the planning, preparation or waging of a war of aggression, or war in violation of international treaties, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing."

Now let's consider the judging nations on that count. Certainly no such indictment could be made of America, Britain or France in regard to the last war, but what of Soviet Russia? What of the war against Finland in 1939 in violation of the Russo-Finnish Pact, to say nothing of the Kellogg Pact? What of the attack on Poland in 1939 in violation of the Kellogg Pact, which Russia had specifically ratified and defined jointly with Poland, not to speak of other Russo-Polish treaties? What of the invasion and occupation of the Baltic countries in violation of pacts with each country?

Russia was guilty of technical aggression even in the second war against Finland for she attacked Finland by an *undeclared* bombardment of Helsinki in June, 1941, the moment Germany invaded Russia, without any act of war on Finland's part. At that time the State Department issued a statement branding Russia as an aggressor. Russia pleaded self-defense on the ground that Finland *would* have attacked her with Germany's help, but that was exactly the same argument which Germany used when she invaded Belgium in 1914 and called her treaty a scrap of paper. The Germans then said they feared that Belgium was going to allow the French army to attack Germany through Belgium, therefore Germany attacked first. They used the same argument to justifying their attack on Belgium in 1940 and, since the relations between Belgium and France were closer than those between Finland and Germany, if we deny the plea in one case we must deny it in the other.

In her fine column on October 23rd Dorothy Thompson shows that the acceptance of this plea would make a mockery of the Nuremberg claim that it had outlawed aggressive war. As a matter of fact, aggressors always have and always will justify their aggression as a "preventive war" to forestall attack. Both Napoleon and Hitler, for instance, justified their invasions of Russia on that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ground and Hitler even invoked it in connection with his attack on Poland. Moreover, it is a line of defense which can never actually be disproved, so if once accepted it is a foolproof formula for aggression.

To return to Finland, in 1941 there were only a few German troops in the extreme north which were there *with Russia's consent* during the Hitler-Stalin pact. And not even this excuse applied to Russia's first attack on Finland in 1939.

So much for the technical guilt of waging aggressive war. A list of 27 alleged violations by the Soviet of various treaties and agreements was printed in the December 29th, 1945, issue of the *New Leader* in an article by Julius Epstein.

Now as to the Nuremberg charge of "conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing," crimes listed above. Here is the text of a secret agreement between Ribbentrop and Molotov pertaining to Poland, produced by Ribbentrop's defense counsel at Nuremberg, although not admitted in evidence due to Russian objections. It was first revealed in America by Richard L. Stokes in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* on May 22nd, 1946; its authenticity has since been further corroborated. The history of this document was explained by Julius Epstein in the *New Leader* of June 8, 1946. The passage follows:

> In the case of a politico territorial change in the territories belonging to the Polish state, the spheres of interest between Germany and the USSR shall be divided approximately following the line on the rivers Narow, Vistula and San. The question as to whether the interest of both parties makes it desirable to maintain an independent Polish state, and how the frontiers of this state should be fixed *can be clarified in a final manner only in the course of further political events.* In any case, both governments will solve this question by way of a friendly understanding. (Italics ours.)

The frontier defined above divided Poland evenly between Russia and Germany, hence Stalin benefitted as much as Hitler.

Remember that this agreement was made on August 23, 1939, before the German attack on Poland. It was part of the Hitler-Stalin pact which gave the green light to nazi aggression. Can there be any doubt that the "further political events" envisaged in the pact referred to the already planned nazi invasion of Poland, Hitler's first act of aggressive war? If ever there was evidence of participation in a conspiracy, this is it. Technically, moreover, there can be no question of Russia's guilt in the attack on Poland for she not only encouraged that attack but later joined it. It was really a combined operation which, as Stalin said in a message to Hitler in October 1939, sealed German-Soviet friendship in blood—Polish blood.

But there is also increasing evidence that Soviet guilt went beyond any mere technicality. Hitherto the only defense of apologists for Soviet Russia's stab in the back was that since Germany attacked Poland first, Russia had no choice but to occupy half of Poland to prevent the nazis taking the whole country. But in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs* there are 24 pages giving the condensed record of interviews with various German leaders before the Nuremberg trials, and the evidence in these interviews is largely confirmed by captured documents, including the above secret clause in the Russo-German pact. There is no space to summarize the interviews here, but they were recorded by Dewitt Poole, a high official of the Office of Strategic Services, and the effect of these revelations is to confirm the theory that Hitler would not have attacked Poland when and as he did if he had not first made his treaty with Stalin. They indicate that Hitler's advisers, such as Goering, were mostly opposed to the attack and that Hitler himself was uncertain until the pact went through. As Mr. Poole puts it, "Hitler on his side looked on any solution of the Polish problem which operated against Russia as difficult and dangerous."

★

The next paragraph in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal defines War Crimes as follows: ". . . namely, violations of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include but not be limited to murder, ill treatment or deportation for slave labor, or for any other purpose, of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war, or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages or devastation not justified by military necessity."

Under this count it is possible to charge America and Britain with war crimes in connection with our saturation and fire bombing of German and Japanese cities, even before our atom bombing of Japan. Obviously the theory of what was "justified by military necessity" on our part was stretched to the extreme limit and beyond. However, in extenuation it is at least true to say that we did not engage in these violations of the laws of war until after the nazis and Japanese had first done so, and done so, moreover, in a war of clear-cut aggression which threatened the liberties of the world. Hence our action can be at least partly justified as self-defense and reprisal.

But what of "murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war, or deportation for slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of occupied territory" mentioned above? Here there is a mass of recent evidence that Russia and her satellites have committed the same crimes on perhaps an even greater scale than the nazis. Moreover, the plea of self-defense cannot be raised in extenuation *for the Soviets did not commit these crimes against the Germans only,* but committed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them first against the Poles and Balts, countries which never declared war against Russia and which never fought Soviet Russia in this war.

For instance, it is now established that the Russians had already deported approximately 1,500,000 Poles from Poland during the Hitler-Stalin pact before the nazi attack on Russia. Reputable Jewish relief agencies themselves charged that half a million Jews were among these deportees, and surely the Russians will not pretend that these Jews were "pro-nazi Polish fascists," the excuse given in the case of other Poles. Yet the Jews, too, were deported from their homes, often separated from their families and put to forced labor under terrible conditions which caused the death of many thousands.*

After Hitler's attack on Russia many of these Poles, Jews and non-Jews, were permitted to leave Russia thanks to the efforts of General Sikorski, and they can bear witness to the treatment they received, but needless to say they were not called to Nuremberg. Later Russia broke her agreement with Sikorski and, under the guise of "liberation," a new wave of deportations began.

On October 18th, the American Government made the official charge that hundreds of American citizens are now working as slave laborers in Yugoslavia and Russia. In Yugoslavia alone we charge that there are 165 such slave laborers, that ten have already died, that none of them were given a trial. Yet for every single American citizen so treated there are probably a hundred thousand others, and if Nuremberg means anything then those millions of victims are as much our concern as though they were American citizens.

A specific item of the Nuremberg indictment, inserted at Russia's request, but significantly omitted from the trial itself, was the charge that the Germans murdered the 5,000 Polish officers whose bodies were found at Katyn. But the fact remains that Polish relatives of those officers, and some of the officers themselves who miraculously escaped, accuse the Soviet government of the assassinations. It is impossible to give all the known facts about this tragedy here, but some of the circumstantial evidence which points to Soviet Russia as the guilty party can be summarized:

(1) There were 8,000 Polish officers and 7,000 non-commissioned officers captured by the Russians who disappeared and have never been found alive—not 5,000. Only half of the officers were imprisoned in the Kozielsk camp, which was near the Katyn forest where the bodies were discovered. The rest of the officers were last heard of in other camps only one of which was ever captured by the Germans. If the 5,000 found at Katyn were killed by the Germans, and not by the Russians, where are all the others?

(2) There is evidence that the officers disappeared before the Germans invaded Russia because (a) mail addressed to them through the International Red Cross, which had been received for the first six months after their capture by the Russians, was returned to their families undelivered long before the Germans invaded Russia.

(b) After the German invasion, when General Sikorski went to Moscow, he repeatedly asked Marshal Stalin and other Soviet officials about these 8,000 missing commissioned officers, who were the most essential single factor for the rebuilding of the Polish army, but Stalin gave evasive and contradictory answers.**

(3) Long after the Germans invaded Russia, they claimed in April, 1943 to have discovered these 5,000 Polish bodies at Katyn. They called in some scientists from occupied and neutral countries to verify the discovery and the condition of the bodies. The bodies (and this was later confirmed after the Russians recaptured Katyn) were clad in winter uniforms, *many in fur coats,* which conflicted with the Russian story that they had been murdered by the Germans in the summer of 1941. (Incidentally, since the Germans unlike the Russians were desperately short of fur they were unlikely to have permitted these fur coats to be buried.) The condition of the bodies indicated, according to these experts, that they had died in April, 1940, a year before the German invasion of Russia, a date which coincided with the testimony of the Poles who escaped their fate.

(4) When the Germans made their announcement in April, 1943 the Polish Government, whose questions to the Soviet about the officers had remained for years unanswered, called on the International Red Cross to investigate the whole question. This Polish action was branded by the Soviet Government as pro-German and used as its excuse for breaking diplomatic relations with Poland. However, the International Red Cross was headed by Count Folke Bernadotte, a highly respected Swede of pro-Allied sympathies, whose daring trip to Germany just before the nazi surrender saved the lives of many of Hitler's prisoners, by persuading Himmler to collaborate in the hope of saving his own skin. Actually the attitude of the International Red Cross was so correct that it refused to act because Russia did not join in the invitation.

(5) As regards motive, although both Germany and Russia had a motive for destroying

*Full authority for the facts on Jewish deportations is cited in an article by Bertram C. Wolfe in the March 1945 issue of *Common Sense*. The (Jewish) Joint Distribution Committee has estimated the total number of evacuees from Soviet-occupied Polish territory at 2,000,000 of which 600,000 were Jews.

**Mr. Wieslaw Arlet, now in New York, who was former Assistant Director of the Polish Information Service in New York and who was General Sikorski's aide in his negotiations with Marshal Stalin, bears witness to the above and there is other corroborating testimony.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poland and her army, the Russians had a more obvious motive for especially destroying the officers who were anti-Communist to a man, although they had fought bravely against the Germans. In other words, the Polish officers belonged to the same ideological groups which Russia has since outlawed in Poland.

Obviously the above facts are not enough to convict the Russians of the Katyn crime in a court of law, but they do cast the gravest doubt on this part of the Nuremberg indictment.

The whole record of Nuremberg, in fact, makes a grim farce of the Soviet judge's complaint when Schacht and von Papen were acquitted, since there is every reason to believe that some of the Soviet judge's own masters should have been indicted with the elusive doctor.

To make matters worse Justice Jackson now stresses the "solidarity" of the Allies at Nuremberg, in contrast to other conferences, as one vindication of the trials, even though it is now clear that this solidarity was achieved only by such sacrifice of principle as to undermine the integrity of the whole effort. It would have been far better if the Western nations had themselves tried the criminals they captured and let Russia try those she had captured, for in that case at least some of the nazi criminals would have been condemned by judges with clean hands.

None of this indictment of Soviet Russia's rôle serves to change the overwhelming guilt of the nazi criminals; but it does change the value of the trials themselves. As it is, the trials were not only premature and incomplete, they bore the fatal taint of hypocrisy, a taint which only complete frankness can ever remove.

We have no power, of course, to secure the trial of Soviet or satellite war criminals. That must await the establishment of a real world government and a real world court. But the vindication of the trials can only come when at least an effort is made to bring all who commit similar crimes to justice.

A special responsibility rests on Justice Jackson himself, who has repeated since the trial the sentiment which he expressed as follows in his opening address at Nuremberg:

> . . . And let me make clear that while this law is first applied against German aggressors, the law includes, and if it is to serve a useful purpose, it must condemn aggression by any other nation, including those which now sit here in judgment.

For the sake of Nuremberg itself, surely it is encumbent on its protagonists, especially Justice Jackson, at least to protest when similar crimes are committed by Soviet Russia and by Tito today. By such protests, based on the Nuremberg theory, they can help to save that theory for the future, so that the monumental work done at Nuremberg shall not have been in vain.

Communications

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: I read with some astonishment an article published by you in the August 16, 1946 edition of THE COMMONWEAL, referring to the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, AFL, of which I am privileged to be Assistant International President. You remark, at the very outset, that "some very sad things happened at the recent convention in Chicago" of the International Alliance. I think this comment wholly unwarranted.

The Convention was notable for its strict adherence both in letter and in spirit, to democratic processes. Its sessions were open to the press for their usual vigilant scrutinization; yet, no one has found reason to infer, as I believe you do, that the Alliance is in danger of becoming an autocratic organization. It has indeed been a difficult task for International President Walsh and his administration to overcome the inherited disrepute which clung to the Alliance as a result of the infamous activities of certain of its prior officers—but I am proud to say, modestly, that we have successfully met the challenge and from day to day are accomplishing more.

You say that the alleged fact that thirty Negro delegates were not allowed to take seats was the first of these "very sad things" that "happened at the recent convention in Chicago of the International Alliance." This premise is completely wrong. The facts are directly to the contrary. The Alliance had, for many years, among its hundreds of affiliated unions, some few auxiliary locals which are composed wholly of Negro members. On a number of occasions, as a result of the non-discriminatory policy of the present administration, the members of these colored auxiliaries were offered the opportunity to join up with and to become members of the regular local unions of the International Alliance; but for reasons of their own, they declined the invitation in each instance.

It was their desire to maintain the Negro unions as separate entities, with full local autonomy and the right of full representation at conventions of the organization. They were not entitled to delegates at the July convention (and those who sought to be seated at the opening of the convention were not elected as such), because they were not autonomous locals, and the laws of our organization were unmistakably clear on this question. However, at the recent convention, through the efforts of this administration under the leadership of President Walsh, the Negro locals were definitely placed upon a parity with other locals in the Alliance and they will have representation at future conventions equal to that of other affiliates. The Negro representatives publicly thanked President Walsh for the interest he had taken in their behalf.

Now, as to your statement that the IATSE has "granted power to its president, Richard F. Walsh, 'to add, alter or amend any portion of the constitution or by-laws he deems necessary.'" This is incorrect. That

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power was given by the convention to the General Executive Board *and* the International President, not to the International President alone—and it was given *only* with respect to the serious and critical Hollywood labor situation—and was given by the convention not to Mr. Walsh as an individual but rather to the International President; and at a time when it was not known whether President Walsh had or had not been re-elected by the convention. It is important to remember that this authority was vested in the General Executive Board and in the International President to amend portions of the Constitution and By-laws of the International Alliance solely for the purpose of meeting and combatting aggressive assaults against the Alliance in connection with the serious strife and critical controversies rampant in the Hollywood movie studios.

You also complain that it was "crazy action of the convention delegates at Chicago" to instruct President Walsh and the General Executive Board "to take immediate steps to rid the International of any subversive, radical or communist groups." The effect of this resolution was to galvanize action against the totalitarian elements seeking to capture the IATSE in certain key spots for the glory of communism and the Soviet Union. But this convention action was not "fascism"—for not only was the resolution adopted after long debate, but before it can be invoked, there must be written charges, a fair trial, and the accused will have the complete right of representation by counsel and appeal, in accordance with the laws of the IATSE. We must fight vigorously against subversive infiltration into our organization or we will become a prey either to the racketeer elements of gangsterism or the communist elements of the Soviet fifth column.

The Alliance, as you know, is a labor organization, the purpose of which is to improve the wages and working conditions of its members and workers generally. Like any other organization, or for that matter, like our nation itself, it is under solemn obligation to resist any attempts, directly or otherwise, to undermine, weaken or to destroy its effectiveness in carrying out its salutary objects. In recent months, more so than ever before, the Alliance has been subjected to repeated and concerted attacks by various groups and subversive elements, both from within and without, attempting to infringe upon the rightful jurisdiction of the Alliance and to pervert its purpose to political ends. We would be derelict in our duties were we to sit idly by in the face of these attacks.

While you recognize in your article that pernicious and disruptive activities are being constantly engaged in by Herbert Sorrell and his Communist Party supporters to gain control of the movie industry as an influential medium to propagandize their political beliefs, you would deny to our organization the inherent right to take measures of self-defense to ward off these virulent attacks. This seems to me an incongruous position. Danger lies not in the grant of necessary powers to meet current exigencies—a grant, which incidentally, came practically unanimously from the delegates at the convention—but rather in the underlying forces and circumstances that give rise to such emergencies. The grant of authority to any person or organization, however slight, always involves the possibility of abuse, but certainly, that ought not to stand in the way of taking effective action in case of crisis. When and if an abuse of the power should occur, that is the time to lodge complaint. There has not been, nor will there be, any such abuse of power by President Walsh or his administration. You admit that "reliable observers have reported that in the six years under Walsh the record of the IATSE has been clean." The record of the past has established conclusively that there will be no abuse, and that record will be further substantiated by the passage of time in the future.

The term of office of the President of the Alliance was, at President Walsh's own request, reduced from four to two years. Certainly, that does not evince any desire on his part to grasp and retain authority beyond that which is duly delegated to him by the membership of the Alliance! His re-election by secret ballot, in a democratic, free and open convention, has been a resounding victory and tribute to the merit, fairness and accomplishment of his leadership. . . .

I don't know whether you have followed the situation in our organization. But, recently, in St. Louis, when unsavory elements sought to resume their old control of one of our local unions, President Walsh acted quickly and effectively. In that regard, I just want to cite an unsolicited letter received by President Walsh from The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in which the following is stated:

> Allow me to congratulate you on your effective efforts to prevent the taking over of your local in St. Louis by racketeers, as described in Mr. Riesel's column of labor comment in the New York *Post*. It is such courageous action as yours which will keep the labor movement clean, and all good citizens are with you.

It is my humble view that, in view of the fight which Mr. Walsh is making to keep out crooks and communists from our organization, he was very properly given the necessary weapons by the convention, and the IATSE should receive the unstinting "support of thousands of men of good will," including that of yourself.

THOMAS J. SHEA.
Assistant International President.

RELIGION AND CIVILIZATION

Washington, D. C.

TO the Editors: As I read Monsignor Knox's eloquent and almost classical defense of individual liberty and freedom, I couldn't help but sympathize with Bevin and de Gasperi and Bidault—to say nothing of their equally uncomfortable counterpart in the White House. For the Monsignor was rather hard on all of them, if only indirectly and by implication. Nor could I help but envy the author's very calm and almost olympian detachment from the confusion of the hustings and the marketplace. His brilliant essay (for which may THE COMMONWEAL be rewarded) was like a page from Plato inserted inadvertently by the printer into a Congressional report on the Full Employment Act of 1946.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To others perhaps it will seem to be an appropriate preface for the next edition of "The Road to Serfdom."

All of which is by way of suggesting, with deference and with certain misgivings, that Monsignor Knox has only scratched the surface of a desperately complicated problem. It might even be added that the article as it stands (and perhaps in spite of the author's intentions) will be of value principally to conservative politicians who are searching, as politicians are wont to do, for Catholic footnotes for their press releases. The article, in other words, will give considerably more comfort in the United States to those who follow the "Wealth of Nations" than to those who subscribe to *"Quadragesimo Anno."*

This is not to deny that Monsignor Knox has written well and even brilliantly about the nature and the sacredness of human dignity and freedom, values which admittedly cannot be defended too often or too ably. But human dignity and freedom cannot be discussed in a vacuum—least of all in an election year. Nor can they be discussed very profitably without reference to the current facts of economic life and to the insistent requirements of the general welfare. The point is almost too obvious to require illustration. Let us merely suggest, therefore, that Monsignor Knox owes it to all of us and particularly to the British Labor Party to indicate in a second article the kind of economic system he would advocate as a substitute for the contemporary systems which he seems to be criticizing. He ought to tell us whether or not he actually believes that it's possible to safeguard the dignity and the freedom of the individual without benefit of social security legislation or (on the Continent and in the British Isles) without a certain minimum of nationalization. It's conceivable, of course, that he wasn't actually criticizing the Beveridge plan and similar social experiments. But the present writer thought that he was, and so did others who have read the article.

In passing, may I refer to another recent essay by a fellow-countryman and co-religionist of Monsignor Knox —"Catholics and Economic Reconstruction," by Mr. Michael Fogarty ("Essays in Reconstruction," Sheed & Ward). The following quotation from Fogarty's more extensive essay is recommended, not indeed as a rebuttal, but rather as a supplement to the Monsignor's rather theoretical and somewhat undiscriminating analysis of the present position of Christians vis-a-vis the social-service state: "Granted that the economic policies which are now being put forward (by the Labor Government), in spite of their apparent correspondence with Catholic principles, derive mainly from a trend which lies away from Christianity in any form, it remains to answer the question of what the Catholic attitude to these policies should be. A common Catholic reaction on recognizing the nature of the trend, is to conclude, first, that these policies should be directly opposed, and, secondly, that every effort should at the same time be made to destroy the basis of the trend by restoring appreciation of the Christian principles on which a right conception of social policy should be founded. This attitude has two serious weaknesses. One is due to the coincidence between the practical measures indicated at this particular moment by Catholic and general economic thought. Purely destructive criticism is extremely bad propaganda; and, since it is usually impossible to point out a practical policy which is at the same time technically satisfactory, clearly differentiated from the policies which are most commonly put forward by representatives of the general trend of thought, and more obviously in accordance with Catholic principles, the criticisms made by this particular group of Catholic thinkers have tended to be very largely destructive. Such constructive proposals as have been put forward have tended to be technically inadequate. The whole series of proposals which can be classed together as distributism are the clearest, though by no means the most important example."

As long as Fogarty has referred to distributism, it may be appropriate to mention that the first American edition of Belloc's "The Servile State," which was issued just a few days ago after a lapse of more than a quarter of a century, is being advertised as collateral reading to Hayek's "Road to Serfdom." It would be most unfortunate if Monsignor Knox's illuminating essay were to suffer a similar fate. GEORGE G. HIGGINS.

THE ESTRADA INCIDENT

New York, N. Y.

TO the Editors: I was grateful to George P. Doherty and the editors of THE COMMONWEAL for giving wide publicity to the curious suppression of *Estrada,* organ of Christian Democrats in the Argentine (THE COMMONWEAL, November 1, 1946).

Christian Democrats have not had easy sailing within the Church. The authoritarian political outlook, culminating in the Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and Salazar type of régime, is, alas, too prevalent among Catholics. What is curious about this suppression in Buenos Aires is that the reason for it was not given. Gregory XVI, when he condemned *L'Avenir,* took pains to indicate the principles condemned. And Pius XI, when he condemned *L'Action Française,* also indicated why he moved against that authoritarian reactionary organ. The Popes have had the courtesy to offer reasons why certain groups and currents were condemned. It is not unreasonable to expect Cardinal Copello to explain why he made the reading of *Estrada* a reserved sin.

Perhaps the explanation of the Cardinal's action lies in this. Spanish-speaking Catholics seem to have a strong Erastian or Gallican tradition. The Spanish temporal authority has used the Church to do its work, dirty and otherwise. Is it not likely that when Perón was elected and Tamborini defeated, Perón, the head of the state, "suggested" to Cardinal Copello the advisability of suppressing *Estrada,* supporter of his opponent? Cardinal Copello was thus placed on the spot. Either he tells Perón to go to blazes and so takes the consequences for himself and the Church, or he sacrifices the public effort of this small, but lively and promising group of intellectual and socially-minded Catholics. Add to this the pressure of conservative, wealthy Catholics supporting Perón's "suggestion." Thus the suppression, and what nowadays passes for "peace."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is only an inference and conclusion. But how else can one interpret the silence and refusal to see the leaders of *Estrada;* the refusal to offer explanations. There is no other: Perón didn't offer any "reasons" along with the "suggestion." Cardinal Copello had at least the honesty of not attempting to manufacture any "reasons," however plausible.

This brings up another interesting point. Now that the parties of Christian inspiration are strong in Europe, winning many victories against great opposition, lack of money, trained personnel, opposition of the British, American and Russian occupation armies, non-Catholics in this country are saying that these parties are really the long arm of "the Vatican," a front for "the hierarchy," the willing "tools of reaction," etc.

But the *Estrada* incident illustrates that the men of the Church meant by these detractors do not take too kindly a view of the Christian Democrats, especially during the times when they are a minority, lacking influence and power. Lacordaire, Daniel O'Connell, Montalembert, Ventura, Rosmini, Toniolo, Marc Sangnier, Abbé Maudet, Don Luigi Sturzo—to mention a few—have been subjected to all kinds of discrimination and exile and persecution at the hands of Catholics from the top of the ecclesiastical and lay ladder down. The Chilean Christian Democrats met fierce opposition within the Church at the hands of many wealthy Catholics and members of the clergy. . . . If the Christian Democrats are an instrument of reaction, they are an instrument that the "reaction" has everywhere attacked.

Out of this emerges the truth that Christian Democracy is an independent, non-confessional, *political* movement. If we Americans learn this we will have gone a long way towards understanding the function and meaning of the Christian Democratic parties in Europe.

JOSEPH CALDERON.

The Stage & Screen

The American Repertory Theater: Henry VIII

INTRODUCED by this least interesting, perhaps, of Shakespeare's disputed chronicles, the American Repertory Theater emerges as authentic Broadway. Eva Le Gallienne's present venture (*and* Cheryl Crawford's and Margaret Webster's) projects little of the warm shabbiness and impassioned youth of the old "Civic," and yet one imagines a good bit of the same valor must have gone into its planning. In any case, in its initial offering, one has a various company to consider, plus most extravagant mountings and guises by David Ffolkes, plus a complete incidental score by Lehman Engel. As readers of this column know, Miss Webster's system of staging Shakespeare is not wholly my cup of tea. It is a system of tableaux, gesture, and roving voice as far as the principals are concerned, whatever motion it presents being supplied usually by numbers of extra people. Here, it is displayed quite purely, with the majority of Mr. Ffolkes's architectural sets (notably in the Buckingham farewell scene), being used mainly for *picture;* and with the addition of one entire scene (the Coronation), being shown entirely in dumb-how behind a scrim. Pageant, as well as speechifying, is employed throughout. There is no question, I think, that this is authentic theater. However, I feel it is also, at this time, threatened theater. Its crux—spectacle—is handled so much more gigantically by the movies; and after the movies, the movie houses (Radio City, for example), have surfeited even the simple public upon it. And to music, with any precision and choice, surely its modern field is the ballet. But, aside from these speculations, it is indeed when Miss Webster plots motion for her ranking people that dire peculiarities occur. A kind of old-hat, unmotivated stage sweep is utilized; the old semi-circular "star" placement business (Butler Davenport), which is, frankly, funny. The Queen's court scene is a fair example of this. I think it is impossible to say quite how distressing this scene is, with its false crosses and hurls, in the opposite direction from the exits; or quite how badly Miss Le Gallienne plays it. Its obvious artifice is only rivaled by her embarrassing arrangement of gestures, here substituting for the author's indicated pantomime, in the death scene. The part is not one of her achievements. But I think she was not aided by the staging. Miss Webster's *heard* Shakespeare is always superlative—you cannot listen to iambics better read, I imagine, anywhere on the English-speaking stage—but perhaps that is the point: it is *read* not *played* stuff; has little life.

The company, on the whole, measures well. For the system, there are too few supers and a number of them fail to carry the costumes. But the repertory chance should solve this latter awkwardness. Walter Hampden's Wolsey is expectedly ponderous; Richard Waring's Buckingham truly moving. The casting of Ernest Truex as the Lord Chamberlain seemed to me inexplicable, as hampering to his own vaudeville technique as to the play. Victor Jory's Henry I thought brisk and refreshing, although his plain makeup, even from the front of the large orchestra, lamentable. Certainly the *gorgeousness* of the whole will smite many people happily: there is parade as well as poetry for your ticket. I wish I could say I thought both were fine.

What Every Woman Knows

THE BARRIE piece comes off better; is, in fact, a joy. I suppose nostalgic reminiscences of Helen Hayes in this small saga of the little woman who WINS, will quarrel with some people's sense of curiosity; but I think here, Miss Webster's version, her staging, the acting, the entire production, is nice. And for the wary, the business will strain, of course, nobody's brain. I do feel there is a kind of catch in the at present large employment of June Duprez in the company. Playing Maggie (Ann Bullen in the previous Shakespeare), there is little to record of Miss Duprez, except, perhaps, competence. She is not charming; and in a part which builds on little else, this is unfortunate. The evening is divided between Miss Le Gallienne's Comtesse de la Briere, and Richard War-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing's John Shand. Mr. Waring supples Miss Duprez's lack: he is a very good actor and moreover young, personable and virile. He is interesting to watch and look forward to. It is true Miss Le Gallienne's French lady is all in one line, and rather arch, but every one of her points is made with finesse, and, by the last scene, the house was laughing before she opened her mouth. I thought a young actor, Arthur Keegan, as the youngest Wylie son, attractive; and Philip Bourneuf, as his elder brother, neat. Cavada Humphrey's silent, pallid Maid created questions in the section in which I was sitting; I hope she will be more generously seen soon. For quibbles, whatever system of organ "musac" is used during these intermissions is fearsome; and both productions, so far, have been poorly ushered and house-managed. Nobody is seated when the lights lower; and everyone seems always to be in the wrong aisle, with nothing to do but a Chaplin cross, directly over your feet. In conclusion, this is for everyone over eighty, and as far as I can see, everyone under it; saving only (alas) the intellectuals. (*At the International.*)

Park Avenue

THE CONSIDERABLE talents of Leonora Corbett, Arthur Margetson, a young man called Ray McDonald, and Mary Wickes, seemed to me utterly wasted in this huge musicana devoted to the joys of divorce. Surely, Nunnally Johnson, George S. Kaufman, Ira Gershwin, and Arthur Schwartz must have somehow slipped their minds. I would call it—no hits, all error, and entirely expensive. (*At the Shubert.*)

KAPPO PHELAN.

Jenny Made Her Mind Up

CONTINUING Hollywood's current trend, in which big-name stars portray bad women, are two new pictures, both costume affairs with elaborate Grade A productions. No doubt their producers intended just to be entertaining; the results, however, are more like illustrations for Kipling's crack about the female of the species.

"Temptation" is based on the Robert Hichens' novel, "Bella Donna," which has been filmed several times before and is as dated now as would be the previous versions if they were dragged out of storage and run on today's screens. In telling the story of the beautiful, unscrupulous and scheming divorcee who married a wealthy archaeologist (George Brent) and then found him and Egypt too dull for her restless temperament, Scriptwriter Robert Thoeren did not modernize the dialogue and situations as Orry Kelly did with the turn-of-the-century costumes worn by Merle Oberon. Whatever one may think of her actions as a drifter who hopes to build her happiness on lies, Miss Oberon looks stunning in a series of tricky hats and gowns that are most becoming to this femme fatale. Most of the film, directed rather statically by Irving Pichel, is done in a flashback as the woman tells her sordid story to her husband's good friend (Paul Lucas), a doctor who was wise to her from the beginning, but of course had no idea that she could sink as low as murder. Well, she sinks—but not until she has been

NOT ALL OF US
CAN BUY A SMALL
PICTURE GALLERY
BUT anyone with
$5.00 can buy

THE ILLUSTRATED EDITION

of MSGR. RONALD KNOX'S

Translation of

THE NEW TESTAMENT

which contains

30 FULL COLOR PLATES

chosen from the finest pictures in the Galleries of America and England, besides chapter heads, initials and end-papers reproducing wood cuts from 14th and 15th century manuscripts. Not a bad substitute, and a good deal handier in present housing conditions.

Msgr. Knox's translation needs no further praise from the Catholic, Protestant or secular press, much less from us, nor do we think you will need any urging to put this edition at the head of your Christmas Present List.

SHEED & WARD
63 Fifth Avenue
New York 3

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unfaithful with a handsome Egyptian (Charles Korvin) who appealed to her baser nature while her husband was digging in the tomb of a pharaoh. So greatly is she in love with this fortune-hunting cad that she cannot resist his plot to use a slow-working poison on her husband. Among the many other old-fashioned appurtenances to this story is a maid played, with a great deal of fluttering, smelling salts and motherly advice, by Lenore Ulric. In case you give up before the finale, I must tell you that even this maid walks out on her despicable mistress.

If ever a film's title went in for understatement, *"The Strange Woman"* is it. Producer Hunt Stromberg's picture is based on the novel by Ben Ames Williams who warned us last year against women in "Leave Her to Heaven." Mr. Williams must obviously be out sniping against females; but to call this heroine "strange" is putting the case mildly to say the least. Jenny Hager knows what she wants, and having "grown too beautiful for her own good," she seems to have little difficulty in getting it. She gives her drunken father a good push, marries a leering but wealthy old man (Gene Lockhart), incites her stepson (Louis Hayward) into killing his father, scornfully throws this indignant weakling out, and then steals the fiancé (George Sanders) of the only friend who ever treated her decently. Hedy Lamarr makes Jenny beautiful all right (with the help of some 1820 costumes and that gorgeous Lamarr face) and she is able to fool her neighbors with her carefully schemed acts of charity and virtue, but she fails to bring this corny script to life. We are more inclined to giggle at her evil machinations than take her seriously. I don't believe that is what these film makers had in mind; but whatever their intentions were, they couldn't have been just to put us on our guard against women—for the men in this picture are also very "strange."

For the benefit of moviegoers who are tired of watching bad women wreck their own and other people's lives, there is a who-dun-it this week that has something different in the way of plot. *"Nocturne"* follows the attempts of a detective to track down the murderer of a composer who died from a bullet wound while composing a new song. This detective is stymied when ten beautiful suspects are involved—and they are all named Dolores. But when the eleventh Dolores turns up with an airtight alibi, he is more suspicious than ever—and rightly so. Producer Joan Harrison and Director Edwin L. Marin manage to build up enough suspense to hold your interest, although the film gets rather talky at times. This dialogue is fun, though; and George Raft with Lynn Bari, Virginia Huston, Joseph Pevney keep you amused and guessing to the end.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

The Labor Movement

Labor and the Election

THERE IS NO NEED to beat around the bush: labor lost the election. There were of course some Republicans supported by all of labor—men like Senator Flanders of Vermont. There were also some labor leaders who supported all the Republicans—men like Big Bill Hutcheson of the AFL carpenters.

Certainly there were a good many rank-and-filers who must have voted for GOP candidates. But there is no indication that it was a very large percentage. After all, taking the New York vote for governor as a sample, even though it was far from typical, there were still about forty-three percent of the people, or 2,137,545, who voted for Senator Mead.

(Incidentally, this makes the New York *Daily News* poll about 10 percent wrong in favor of Dewey, the *News* candidate. Last year the *News* was 12 percent wrong in favor of O'Dwyer, the *News* candidate. Since a conscientious pollster hangs himself when he is over 5 percent wrong in an election, anyone who hereafter takes a *News* poll seriously should go and stand in the corner for at least two years.)

But to return: the point is that considering the size of the Democratic vote, even in defeat, there is still plenty of room within it for about 80 percent of America's organized workers. And if they followed the advice of 80 percent of their leaders, CIO and AFL, pro-communist and anti-communist, that is where they were. The Democratic defeat is therefore clearly a labor defeat, and it will perhaps be useful to examine it as such, both in its causes and in its effects.

How much was labor itself responsible for the disaster? There were of course a number of factors quite beyond its control. The passionate desire for a change after fourteen years of Democratic administration, the bungling of Harry Truman, the neither-fish-flesh-nor-fowl quality of his administration, the annoying shortages, these were among the most powerful things working to change the mind of that one voter in seven who determines whether the landslide will look like a donkey or an elephant. And it is an unfortunate fact that the average American still does not realize that depressions and unemployment follow Republican policy just as surely as night follows day.

But it would be foolish to maintain that nobody changed sides because of unjustified strikes or from a feeling that labor had abused its power in one way or another. The refusal of labor's officialdom to submit to any shape or form of regulation, to limit its right to strike by so much as a cooling-off period, this certainly had something to do with it. The commentators who say so smugly and patly that the American public has now voted for regulation of big labor in the same way that it once voted for regulation of big business are not quite honest either in their analogy or in their pretense of knowing just what goes on in that one-out-of-seven's mind.

There is nevertheless a grain of truth, a *soupçon* of reality, in what they say. It may well be that within a few months many of our labor leaders will be sorry that they were not a little more receptive to labor legislation in the days when they had a few more friends in Congress. Others may regret that the labor movement did not do more to sweep and garnish its own house while it still had the chance.

Can it be said that this election marked a falling off in the quantity and quality of political action by labor? Yes. Sidney Hillman's energy and ability, and his friendship with Truman, were obviously missed. The communists, and others who take their lead from them, naturally found it difficult to stir up enthusiasm among their fol-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowers for a party which they have been telling everybody is now hopelessly controlled by "reactionaries, warmongers and imperialists." In those sections of the CIO-PAC which these elements control the contradiction had its effect.

The AFL told itself at the recent convention in Chicago that it was going to work harder than ever for the election of its "friends." But the AFL finds hard work discouraging at any time, and in some states it found even more discouraging the problem of figuring out who were its friends.

Mainly though, it was just that the mental image of men like Harry Truman, George Allen and John Snyder at the head of our government failed spectacularly to ring any bells or stir any enthusiasms in labor circles. Say what you will of Roosevelt, Wallace, Ickes and the rest—and you might say plenty—at least they were colorful and positive men. Gray is a nice color, but seldom successful when the tide is running out.

And what of the effects? There are some union officials who are now whistling in the dark and saying that the Republicans will not want to antagonize labor and will probably go easy. This is wishful thinking. Nearly all of the Republicans who were re-elected voted for the Case Bill and other restrictive legislation, most of it even worse. Those who are new to Washington are, with few exceptions, well-known for their sympathy with efforts to shackle the unions. And unfortunately, those Democrats whom the party could best spare, the reactionary gentlemen from the South, are just the ones who fared best at the polls. All of these people have been elected and re-elected either in spite of, or because of, their unfriendly attitude toward labor.

In the past labor has not hesitated to kick the Republicans and Southern Democrats. If, now that labor is down, the opposition refrains from kicking it squarely in the stomach through new Case bills it will indeed be a triumph of charity over human nature.

There remains another question: how will the elections affect the third party movement? The answer depends on the future of the Democratic Party. Arthur Krock is saying, with ill-concealed pleasure, that the conservative wing of the party is now dominant and that it will probably control the convention of 1948. Henry Wallace is saying that "the Democratic Party will either become more progressive or it will die. I do not expect it to die." Still others are saying that he is right, but that there is little chance of its becoming more progressive unless leaders like Wallace first become less confused on the business of a united front with the Stalinists.

In other words, you signs your check and you makes your own conclusions about the future of the Democrats and the consequent chances of a third party movement. From here it looks as though the AFL, by and large, will stick to the Democrats or, if Lewis succeeds Green, may even move toward the GOP. The CIO, on the other hand, with Socialists and possibly CP's dissenting, will undoubtedly go all out to insure a progressive victory in the Democratic convention of '48. If Krock is right and the Byrds, Bilbos and Snyders take complete control, then a good guess is that the CIO and all its friends will soon thereafter be going into business on their own. And the Republicans will be in the White House for at least eight years. In which case, may the good Lord have mercy on us.

JOHN C. CORT.

U. S. A. Liturgical Books Establish An American Tradition

MISSALE ROMANUM

Your Liturgical Books in format, text arrangement, type and binding, mark the beginning of an American Tradition.

U. S. A. LITURGICAL EDITIONS
A MISSALE ROMANUM for EVERY SIZE ALTAR

OCTAVO—7 x 10
For Chapel Altar
Imit. Leather $15 Red Sheepskin $20
Morocco ... $23 Green Morocco ... $28

LARGE QUARTO—9 x 12
For Main Altar
Imitation Leather $35 Sheepskin $40
Morocco ... $45 Green Morocco ... $50

QUARTO—8 x 11
For Side Altar
Imitation Leather $25 Sheepskin $30
Red Morocco $35 Green Morocco $45

HAND MISSAL—4½ x 7
For Altar Use
With finger tabs and ribbon markers.
Imitation Leather, red edge ... $8.50

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM
Editio Typica Vaticana
With the NEW PSALTER and all the latest offices in their proper place throughout the entire text.

LARGE TYPE — 12mo.
4 Volumes—4¾ x 7
Leather ... $35 Sheepskin ... $40
Morocco ... $45 Red Morocco ... $55
Breviary Case with flap ... $3.00

POCKET SIZE — 18mo.
4 Volumes—4 x 6
Leather ... $30 Sheepskin ... $33
Morocco ... $38 Red Morocco ... $48
Breviary Case with flap ... $2.25

MISSAE DEFUNCTORUM
Large Size—9x12—Imitation Leather ... $6.50
Small Size—8x11—Morocco ... $12.00

RITUALS
Baptism—Black Imitation Leather ... $3.00
Marriage—Red Imitation Leather ... $4.00
Burial—Black Imitation Leather ... $4.00
Altar Prayers—Black Imitation Leather ... $3.50

RITUALE ROMANUM
Complete edition with U. S. A. Supplement
Imitation Leather ... $4.50 Leather ... $6.50

Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae
by Rev. I. Wapelhorst, O.F.M.
A handbook of Catholic Liturgy revised according to the latest decrees and the new Canon Law ... $4.75

THE RACCOLTA
Official Edition of the indulgenced prayers of the Church. Translated by Rev. J. P. Christopher, Ph.D. and Rev. Charles E. Spence, M.A. Prayers for every occasion, every purpose. Printed in red and black. One binding only. Imitation Leather, red edge ... $3.85

THE PSALMS—A Prayer Book
The new Latin text of the Psalms with English translation arranged for spiritual reading, meditation and personal devotions. Foreword by Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J. Printed in red and black. One binding only. Imitation Leather, red edge ... $3.85

BENZIGER BROTHERS, INC. 26-28 Park Place, New York 7, N. Y.
BOSTON • CHICAGO • CINCINNATI • SAN FRANCISCO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books of the Week

Priestess of the Occult: Madame Blavatsky. Gertrude Marvin Williams. Knopf. $3.50.

YOU PAYS your money and you takes your choice, as they used to say at fairs. Or, as Annie Besant aggressively put it, "either Helena Petrovna Blavatsky is a messenger from the Masters or else she is a fraud." Mrs. Williams was so fascinated by the foundress of the Theosophical Society that, when writing the life of her successor, she found herself writing continually about the older woman, and had to cut out thousands of words to give her earlier book balance. Now she has been able to let herself go, and the result is a most stimulating biography which every good Theosophist will spew out indignantly and hastily close—but will be unable to resist opening again, and reading on and on, just to see what happened next.

What a life! A self-confessed murderess at four, a bride at sixteen, a bigamist, a medium, and an almost nonstop promoter of occult phenomena, this "moody lioness" who could make respectable Colonels leave wives and children to trail after her across three continents, was "stout and slovenly" by the time she was thirty; and by the time she landed in America, ten years later, she had lost her youth, her lover (by drowning), her family (which had abandoned her as much as she it), her child (whose, Mrs. Williams is not sure—it is rather doubtful if Madame Blavatsky was, either)and her money. Mrs. Williams makes her a lovable old rogue, rather than a sinister one, in spite of the Mahatma letters, the Coulomb letters, the Eddy brothers, Mrs. Hume's brooch, the Adyar shine, the Kiddle plagiarism, the Baron de Palm's MSS and the Betanelly marriage. "Her life exudes a musky odor of mystery and paradox," Mrs. Williams concludes, "a bundle of contradictions, she combined a showman's instinct for popular appeal with the contemptuous arrogance of the old-school aristocrat."

Perhaps of all the crowded, complicated scenes in this unforgettable book, the most moving is when, just before her death, Madame Blavatsky wrote to her sister, confiding that she used to visit the Russian Cathedral in Paris and "stand there with my mouth open, as if standing before my own dear mother whom I have not seen for years and who would not recognize me." Her sister asked the priest attached to the Russian Embassy in London to call, and he did, but, though "Helena received him eagerly and was grateful for this tardy reconciliation, it must be kept secret, her public must never know." Helena Blavatsky had renounced Christianity years before, in 1880, in Ceylon, by taking *pansil,* a Buddhist rite, with every possible fanfare and ostentation.

Mrs. Williams does not make out a very convincing case for Madame's "pathogical trends." She says she hated her mother, and would never mention her, but fails to prove it, and though she says "Helena seems to have been ridden by a haunting sense of inferiority. To compensate, she indulged in fantasies of her superiority over the most powerful creature in her world, in any woman's world, Man," it would rather seem that Madame Blavatsky's relations with, and reactions to, men were perfectly normal, if perhaps rather voraciously so.

The craving of the Theosophists for respectability—a craving Madame Blavatsky certainly shared—is curiously illustrated by their connection with the Liberal Catholics. In 1915-16 practically every English leader of this small sect was lecturing on Theosophy, whilst every male Theosophist who could wangle it, was busy obtaining orders from Liberal Catholic bishops. Which, as the French say, gives to think.

ANNE FREMANTLE.

Lord Hornblower. C. S. Forester. Little. $2.50.

THERE IS NO news in the announcement that this, the fifth and presumably the final chronicle of the adventures and loves of Horatio Hornblower, is an exciting, well-written tale by one of the few master craftsmen in the art of fiction. Mr. Forester has earned this reputation by the four preceding volumes in the series, as well as by two excellent but less well-known earlier stories, "Rifleman Dodd" and "The Gun." It is perhaps exaggerated to compare him with Conrad and Stevenson as a story-teller, but he belongs at least, with Nordhoff and Hall, John Masefield and Nevil Shute, among those writers who have preserved narrative values which the realists have almost completely abandoned.

The plot of "Lord Hornblower" springs into action when Horatio, recovered from a long illness contracted on his Russian expedition, is summoned from a convocation of the Order of the Bath to receive at the hands of Lord St. Vincent himself orders to suppress a mutiny aboard a British brig lying off Le Havre. It is a delicate mission. The mutiny threatened at once to destroy the morale of a British fleet in the final stages of its struggle with Napoleon and to provide the Emperor with the sign of British weakness to help restore the flagging energies of the French. A brilliant ruse, assisted by Hornblower's superb seamanship, results in the capture of the mutinous brig, a French blockade runner, several smaller ships and the city of Le Havre as well. Here Forester adds a dash of politics to the predominantly naval and military action. A Bourbon Duke is brought to Le Havre and the monarchy proclaimed with Hornblower appointed Governor-General. Napoleon's forces, sent from Paris to suppress Hornblower's coup, are defeated by another naval stratagem in which Hornblower's best friend, Captain Bush, is killed. The victorious English escort the royalist party through Rouen to Paris where the first part of the novel concludes in the celebrations ending the war.

In Paris an element of sex is added to the already explosive combination of war and politics. Hornblower meets his old love Marie, the Vicomtesse de Graçay, just as his wife, the Lady Barbara, is departing for the Congress of Vienna. He spends the hundred days between Napoleon's surrender and the return from Helena, at Marie's estate at Nevers where Horatio, "the handsomest man in the Royal Navy," displays himself as an ardent and, for those readers who demand a reasonable degree of virtue in their heroes, a dishonorable lover. Upon Napoleon's return Horatio and the de Graçays are forced to flee. Marie is slain by a dragoon and Horatio's life is saved only by the news of Waterloo. When the aide-de-camp announced that the execution would not take place, "his mind was suddenly engrossed with the past . . . he began to wonder about Richard. And Barbara."

No little of Forester's popularity may be traced to his projection of a "modern" hero into a romantic background. For, despite his iron fortitude and his nautical talents, Hornblower is essentially a sensitive, uncertain, and complicated figure. He broods about his past, compares his passion for his wife with that for his mistress,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his observations on the age of Napoleon are in the accent of twentieth-century liberalism. He shares all the virtues of the naval officers, but none of their aristocratic prejudices, and he is compelled to accept the dignity of the peerage, he remains spiritually a democrat. Another reason for Forester's success rests in his technical mastery of structure and style. The book is well-built, chapter to chapter, suspense to suspense; the language is direct, controlled, and charged with that mysterious creative energy which moves the story through the imagination like a fine ship in full sail. Forester has described his own art accurately when Hornblower, pondering the exquisite tracery in Westminster Cathedral, thinks that "there was something mathematically satisfactory in the way the spreading patterns met and re-met, a sort of inspired logic. The nameless workmen who had done that carving must have been far-sighted, creative men."

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY.

Vinland the Good. Nevil Shute. Morrow. $2.50.

THIS IS THE STORY of the discovery of America in 1003 by Leif Ericsson, briefly and brilliantly told in the form of a movie script. Mr. Shute has nonetheless used all his admirable equipment as a popular novelist to good advantage. In 126 pages he has brought to life what to him is "one of the most fascinating adventures in history," and made the tale both far more effective and far more honest than the elephantine dilutions and distortions which have won favor as "historical novels" in recent years.

American readers will be interested in the new English interest in American history reflected in the framework of this book. If the average Englishman used to sum up his history as "1066 and all that," the average American is apt to find that his most vivid historical recollection is that Columbus "discovered" America in 1492. For this living recreation of a largely forgotten chapter in our past, Mr. Shute deserves our thanks.

MASON WADE.

Journal from My Cell. Roland de Pury. Harper. $1.50.

IMAGINE a Swiss citizen, pastor of a reformed church in France and an Oglate father from the Vendée sitting on their prison cot in Montluc together composing the "ten commandments of the new order": I am the Lord, thine enemy, who casts thee into the house of slavery, the graveyard of the living. Thou shalt hear no other voice but mine. Thou shalt have no other space than thy cell. Thou shalt not know how long thou shalt be there. Thou shalt not read. Thou shalt not talk. Thou shalt not write. Thou shalt do nothing. Thou shalt not sing, nor whistle, nor smoke. Thou shalt not receive any news of thy people, nor of the world. Thou shalt not send any news to them. On these conditions thou shalt have thy hash regularly twice a day, served in thy quarters, and fifteen minutes to exercise and to wash thyself. And then the priest is taken away from the poor minister by the nazi jail warden and that dreadful, idle, stifling solitude is back all around the man, left alone only with God and his Bible. A few days later they send him another companion, a loutish youngster, who swallows his soup "almost before I have begun mine. I show him a passage in the Bible . . . to try to understand, but he swallows the pages in a couple of minutes. Is not culture . . . knowing how to *pause* over things. The barbarian devours. The civilized man tastes."

★ YALE ★

An Amazing Revelation of Christian Faith

GOD WITH US

THREE MEDITATIONS

S. L. Frank

Professor Semyon Ludwigovitch Frank, who occupies a foremost place among Russian philosophers of the present day, touches upon various aspects of religious faith in general and of its most perfect expression in the Christian revelation. "What most distinguishes this book is the intense religious conviction of the writer . . . Faith, for Dr. Frank, is neither belief without grounds, nor submission to authority. It is 'the encounter of the human heart with God, God's manifestation to it.'"—W. R. Inge in the *Hibbert Journal.*

$3.00

THE LIBERAL TRADITION

William A. Orton

In this excellently written analysis of our great tradition and current troubles, Professor Orton reveals the very source of the maladies that are coming close to wrecking the Western World. "One of the wisest and most Christian books published in this century on the present disintegration of civilization . . . Buy it, read, mark, learn, and digest it."—*The Living Church.* "This book is not for specialists, but for the general educated reader."—*The Commonweal.* *Third Printing.*

$3.50

Conversations With An Unrepentant Liberal

Julius Seelye Bixler. Two philosophers, friends and contemporaries of Plato, continue their discussions of life and death and religion today. " . . . one of the best and most timely things in print in the religious field."—*Advance.* $2.00

At all bookstores

★ Yale University Press, New Haven 7, Conn ★

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHRISTMAS

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS
by the Very Rev. Martin B. Hellriegel

"A beautiful treatment of the Mass is matched with reverent artistry."—*The Priest.*

Third printing. 66 *pages.* Illustrated. *Cloth.* $1.50

A GREAT SACRAMENT
by Dom Albert Hammenstede, O.S.B.

A Gift Book on the Sacrament of Marriage.
32 *pages.* 75 *cents.*

OUR CHILDREN'S YEAR OF GRACE
by Therese Mueller

Bringing Christ into the home.
Artistic format. 44 *pages.* Illustrated. 50 cents.

Pio Decimo Press
1946 CHRISTMAS CARDS

Set No. I. New Designs .....10 cards $1.00
Set No. II. Designs from other years....10 cards $1.00

Individual cards may be ordered in bulk.

10 large cards for $1.25
10 small cards for 75 cents

All include envelopes. Please allow postage.

PIO DECIMO PRESS BOX 53, BADEN STA. ST. LOUIS 15, MO.

DO YOU KNOW

- The news behind the labor news?
- The inside dope on our labor leaders?
- The Catholic angle on current labor problems?

If not, read—

THE LABOR LEADER

Published twice a month by the

Association of Catholic Trade Unionists

Subscription $1 per Year.

Sample copy on request.

226 Lafayette Street New York 12, N. Y.

Month after month goes by in desperate solitude. What a human, what an honest and what a Christian book! A fine flower of Protestant spirituality, biblical and un-mystic, of a clear purity and intensity seldom seen. Has anybody ever described the human, natural joy of liberation more directly? "They put us aboard a train [to free Switzerland]. The engine was in the right direction . . . and then came the loud iron noise of the bridge across the Rhine . . . we were on the other side . . . we were out of the train . . . we shook hands with certain inspectors . . . those well beloved men, men of life, angels of deliverance . . . those first men who did not wear the king of Babylon's livery. . . . We filled out wonderful papers. We answered heavenly questions. They gave us tickets to Geneva. On the table was that implement from before the fall known as a fork, and sublime dinner plates, and a long sausage . . . that first meal in the world of the living was like a rite."

The author's modesty, nearness to God, his faith, hope and charity, his courage and conscientiousness make his artless, beautiful book one that we all should read and treasure.

H. A. REINHOLD.

Five Million Patients: The Professional Life of a Health Officer. Allen Weir Freeman. Scribner. $3.00.

THE AUTHOR began his medical life as a student and ends it as professor at Hopkins. He knew the founders and has his characteristic yarn of Osler. "Well, Mr. Freeman, this is your case. What is the first thing we want to do with him?" . . .

"We want to look at him, sir."

"No; we're not ready to look at him yet. What should we do first?" . . .

"Well, the first thing to do is to ask Dr. Lambert to stand out of the light."

(The eternal cry of the real teacher: Look! See!)

The simplicity and directness of Osler is Dr. Freeman's own. There are excellent examples, too, of how far the direct approach will get a State Health Officer when face to face with a practical politician.

EDWARD L. KEYES.

The United Nations. Louis Dolivet. Farrar. $1.75.

A SMALL HANDBOOK which includes brief descriptions of the structure and functions of the UN organization; its assembly, councils, committees and judiciary; the text of the UN Charter; and the names of the delegates by countries.

CONTRIBUTORS

Valentin le DESOSSÉ is known for his portrait by Toulouse Lautrec.

Page GILMAN is "Jack Barbour" of the radio show, "One Man's Family." Serving in the Army he capped his career as aide-de-camp to Major General A. V. Arnold, commanding 7th Inf. Division on Okinawa, and later Military Governor of Korea.

Christopher EMMET, radio news commentator, is also a contributor to the *New Leader* and other publications.

Anne FREMANTLE has recently been lecturing in Canada and criticizing books for the *Herald Tribune* and the *Times* as well as for THE COMMONWEAL.

Francis X. CONNOLLY teaches English literature at Fordham University, New York, N. Y.

Mason WADE is the author whose most recent book is "The French Canadian Outlook."

Rev. H. A. REINHOLD is the pastor of St. Joseph's Parish, Sunnyside, Wash., and the well known leader of the liturgical movement and editor and compiler of "The Soul Afire."

Dr. Edward L. KEYES is one of the founders and first contributors of THE COMMONWEAL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED